



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES, MAINLY TEXTUAL, ON TANTRĀKHYĀYIKA, BOOK II

FRANKLIN EDGERTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THIS COLLECTION OF NOTES is intended to help in blazing the way for a definitiv reconstruction of the hypotheticalal original text of the Pañcatantra, Book II; that is, of the 'Urtext' from which, we must suppose, all extant versions ar descended. Such a definitiv reconstruction is, I am firmly convinst, not a mere dream. A careful comparativ study of the details of all the older extant versions of the Pañcatantra (Book II) has shown me that it is perfectly possible. I do not mean, of course, that we can re-write the entire Sanskrit text of the 'Urpañcatantra'—altho we can actually do that to a large extent; nor do I mean that we can with absolute certainty reconstruct even the substance thereof, from beginning to end. Unless our present sources of knowledge should becom greatly augmented, there wil probably always be certain sentences, paragraphs, and entire stories—in the aggregate rather numerous—about which there wil be room for differences of opinion as to whether they wer found in the original. I do, however, believ most firmly, that such sections wil be insignificant in number and extent, compared with the parts about which it wil be possible to be reasonably certain that *something of the sort*, at least, was found in the original. But furthermore: this 'something of the sort' does not by any means do justis to the degree of exactitude with which it is possible to determin very extensiv parts of the text of the 'Urpañcatantra'. Not only can most of the stanzas be set down word for word, or practically so, as they existed in the Urpañcatantra, and in the exact order in which they wer found there. What is much more surprizing, a not inconsiderable number of prose sentences can be set down just about as definitly, in their original form. And by far the greater part of the prose narrativ, in Book II at any rate, can be determind with sufficient accuracy to make possible what would pass as a free translation of the (non-existent) original text. The number of sentences or paragraphs which ar not wel

enuf preservd in the extant versions to permit reconstruction to this extent is comparatively small.

I hope to publish before long my attempt at a reconstruction of the original Pañcatantra, Book II. I wil postpone until that time a statement of my views of the relation of the several extant versions to the original and to each other. At present I wil say only that my previous estimate of these interrelationships (*AJP* 36. 44 ff., 253 ff., esp. table opposit p. 278) has undergone som slight modifications, but no important ones. In particular, what I formerly said about the position of the Tantrākhyāyika (*l. c.* p. 52 ff.) stil represents quite wel my feeling about it, except that I should be inclined to emfaze more the (as I believ) quite considerable extent of the demonstrably secondary additions made in the text of Tantr. I think that if we had the Sanskrit text from which the Pahlavi was translated, it would be very much closer to the original than the Tantr. But I stil hold that the Tantr. is closer to the original, on the whole (by no means in all details!), than any other text we hav.

If this is so, it follows that the text of the Tantr. is of prime importance for this task of reconstruction. It would therefore be highly desirable to establish the text of the Tantr. on as sound and certain a basis as possible, as a preliminary to our ultimate end.

Unfortunately the text of the Tantr. is not in a very satisfactory state.

Its discoverer and first and only editor, Johannes Hertel, based his edition¹ on four manuscripts, which he calls P, p, z, and R. These (as far as concerns the text of Book II) fall into two

¹ *Tantrākhyāyika. Die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra.* Berlin, 1910 (= *Abh. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, ph.-h. Kl., N. F., xii. 2). The variant readings of the mss. ar quoted in this edition alone. A reprint has been publisht in Professor Lanman's Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 14 (Cambridge, 1915). In the preface to this, which we call the *editio minor* (*ed. min.*), reference is made to certain changes in the text of the *editio princeps*. I hav discoverd no such changes in the text of Book II; the only two deviations I hav observd ar two misprints (page 65, line 17, read *luñcitān eva*; page 88, line 1, read *chittvā* for *cittvā*). The reprint is convenient in size and price, and for cursory reading fairly satisfactory (but cf. note 3 below); it is of course tru, as the editor points out, that the *ed. major* remains 'the indispensable basis for all further scientific investigation' (p. xiii).

groups, to wit, P and p, which Hertel calls the α recension, and z and R, which he calls the β recension. The term 'recension' seems to me misleading. Thruout nearly the whole of Book II, at least, the variations between the two groups are not only infinitesimal, but in character not such as would seem to be implied by this dignified term. The mss. are, in short, all very close to each other, and surely no deliberate or conscious reworking of the text (such as would be implied by the term 'recension') has intervened, in my opinion, between any of them and the author's draft of the Tantr.² I retain Hertel's terms as convenient designations for groups of paleographically related manuscripts (for Hertel is quite right to that extent); but I expressly reject the theory connected with them.

The text of Tantr., as presented by these mss., is in many details problematic. Compared with the general run of Sanskrit fables, it is rather difficult. In a very considerable number of instances Hertel has deemed it necessary to abandon the readings of all his mss. and resort to emendation.³

There is no doubt that in a great many cases this procedure was necessary. But my studies have proved to me that Hertel has carried it much too far. Time and again he has been too impatient with the text, and too ready to substitute a reading of his own construction. One of the first things to be done, then, is to rid the published text of Hertel's unnecessary emendations. I have discovered that in the 36 printed pages of Book II (*ed. min.*), they number one to a page on the average. The list is

² Hertel even believes that his 'recension β ' has suffered interpolation from another Pañc. recension, a product of his hypothetical 'K' (cf. *AJP* 36. 259), which 'K' I believe to be wholly imaginary. I have not discovered any reason to believe that the mss. of β contain a single trace of outside influence—whether from another Pañc. version or any other source.

³ It is most unfortunate, in view of the enormous number of his emendations, that Hertel did not indicate them in his printed text, by the use of asterisks or some similar signs. In the *ed. maj.*, of course, it is possible to discover them from his critical notes (al tho the casual reader might not always remember that ' $\alpha\beta$ ' is his way of designating the totality of his mss.; would it not have been more perspicuous to say 'mss.'?). In the *ed. min.*, however, there is no such assistance. Difficulties and uncertainties in the text are so numerous that even the most casual reader must frequently want to know at least whether or not the reading presented is actually the reading of the mss., or of some of them.

given below. I hav not included therein a number of uncertain instances, nor, of course, any instances of emendations of indefensible manuscript readings.

Next I present an approximately equal number of cases in which it seems to me that Hertel has made a mistaken choice between variant readings of his mss.

After this I giv a small number of emendations of my own, and conclude with a very few corrections of Hertel's translation.

The notes ar numberd consecutivly from 1 to 95. Double referencs ar given, first to page and line of the *ed. min.* (Harvard Oriental Series, No. 14), and then to page and line of the *ed. maj.* Quotations ar always given *first* in the form in which they ar printed in Hertel's text. I use Hertel's designations of the individual mss. and groups of mss. (which latter Hertel calls 'recensions', as above noted).

I. SUPERFLUOUS EMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY HERTEL

1. 54.7 = 64.7, *apaśyat tadadhīṣṭhānavāsīnam* . . . (*pakṣi-bandham*). The mss. omit *tad* (R has *apaśyac cā 'dhi°*), and there is no reason for inserting it. 'He saw a bird-catcher who dwelt in thē-country.'

2. 55.17 = 65.21, *nā 'nyo 'smākam āpado mokṣayite 'ti*. Mss. *mokṣayatī 'ti*. The present is perfectly good; *āpado* is acc., not abl. 'No one else sets [can set] free [unloose, remove] our troubles.' See BR s. v. *mokṣay* 1 (cf. also 3, which is closely similar). Pūrṇ's parallel, *samarthaś cā 'yam āpadvimokṣaṇāya*, can be taken at least as well in this sense ('unloosing, removing, of [our] troubles') as in any other. Other versions ar inconclusiv.

3. 56.15 = 67.2, *badhyante baḍṣāir* . . . *mīnāḥ*. Mss. *bādhyante*, which might be allowd to stand as the Tantr. reading ('ar harast, vext, annoyd'). There is of course no dout that the more appropriate *badhyante*, found in all other versions, was the original. That by no means proves that the tru text of *Tantr.* red so!—The accompanying ablativ may be taken as directly dependent on the subject.

4. 56.31-32 = 67.18-19, *mā tāvan mama pāsāḥ, kiṁ tu prathamam matpariṇānasya chidyantām*. For all of this the mss. read only: *mā tāvan mamā 'sya chīndyantām* (R correctly *chid°*).

The rest is pure conjecture on Hertel's part! It does not even closely follow any other version. The mss. reading is perfectly good, and indeed much more dramatic than the product of Hertel's brain which has crowded it out. Literally, 'not yet of [this me] me-here let-be-cut!' That is, as we might say, 'Don't cut *mine* yet!' Only a very prosaic soul would demand the verbal expression of the noun for 'bonds'; in his excitement the dove uses no more words than are necessary.

5. 57.4-5 = 67.23, *tad yāvad amuṁ bhavān mama pāśaṁ na chinatti*. Mss. *ayaṁ* for *amuṁ*; this should be kept. 'Your worship here' (BR 1, p. 795, towards bottom).

6. 59.11 = 70.22, *sarvathā 'haṁ tvāṁ ātmīkaromi*. No ms. has *tvāṁ*, which is a quite unnecessary insertion; the object is perfectly clear from the context. Cf. number 4, above.

7. 59.19 = 71.5, *pratyāyito 'haṁ bhavatā*. On this see Edgerton, *AJP* 36.257 ff. The mss. read *pratyarthito*, which means 'I am (successfully) opposed (in argument) by you,' 'you have won your case against me'; it is a well-known legal term. Tho there is no doubt that *pratyāyito* (with SP and Pūrṇ) is the reading of the 'Urtext,' there is no need to emend the reading of Tantr.

8. 59.25-26 = 71.9-10, *cittavittābhyāṁ* (better omit *vittābhyāṁ*, see no. 37 below) *saṁgamo vṛddhaye, na punar vittāṁ prabhūtam api. vināśāya kaścīl lāvakebhyas tilān prayacchati*. The mss. all read *saṁgamaṁ* and *prabhūtān*. As to the first, there is lexical authority for *saṁgama* as a neuter, and I should prefer to keep it; it would be by no means the only case of the sort found in Tantr. (cf. also below, number 84); and indeed every new Sanskrit text that is published brings to light numerous new confirmations of such statements of the Hindu lexicographers. But as to Hertel's change of *prabhūtān* to *°tam*, I protest that it simply makes the text say something wholly different from what the author obviously intended. That a *prabhūtān*, after *vittāṁ*, might have got corrupted into *prabhūtam*, is obvious; it is hardly conceivable that *prabhūtam*, in this location, should have got corrupted into *prabhūtān*—as Hertel assumes. Clearly a period should be put after *vittāṁ*, and *prabhūtān* construed with *tilān* in the next sentence. Translate: '. . . but not wealth. Even in great abundance [i. e. with seeming lavishness], 'tis only for their destruction that a man offers sesame to partridges.'

9. 61.16 = 73.15, *punar apy āha*. No ms. has *punar apy*, and this certainly should not have been inserted. I believe that the word *āha* should also be omitted with ms. R; see below, number 41.

10. 62.4 = 74.6, *tīrthabhūta*. The mss. have *tīrthapūta*, 'purified by pilgrimages,' or *tīvrapūta*, 'terribly pure.' Either makes perfectly good sense. In his translation, p. 70, note 3, Hertel correctly interprets the mss. readings; his note does not give me any inkling of his reason for abandoning them.

11. 62.5 = 74.6-7, *snigdhadravapeśālānām*. All mss. *dravya* for *drava*: keep this, and translate 'delicious with sticky substances.' The fact that at 85.4 = 101.7, where the same word occurs, the β mss. have °*drava*°, surely does not prove that *drava* should be red in both passages. On the contrary, the unanimous testimony of the mss. here proves that at 85.4 = 101.7 Hertel should have red *dravya* with the α mss. (which according to him are in general the more original group, anyhow!).

12. 62.13 = 74.13-14, *tasmīnn āpotake śeṣaṁ suguptaṁ kṛtvā*. The words *śeṣaṁ suguptaṁ* are inserted by Hertel without ms. authority, and are quite unnecessary. 'Putting it in that vessel.' This use of *kr* is familiar enough (BR s. v. 13). The β mss. read, after *āpotake*, *tathāi 'va nāgadantake*, 'and in the same manner (putting the vessel) upon the peg'; this seems to me probably correct, though Hertel, for reasons which are not apparent, calls it a 'misslungener Versuch, die Lücke auszufüllen.'

13. 66.18-19 = 79.9-10, *tathāi 'vā 'khyāne*. Mss. *'khyāte*, which should be kept. 'In the same manner (as before), when a story had been told [literally, 'it having been narrated'; loc. abs.].'

14. 69.2 = 82.3-4, *yat satatam dehī 'ti vakti*. Mss. *yas* (i. e. *yah*) for *yat*. '(The fulfilment of whose fate is of this sort, namely—) who is always saying "Giv!"'

15. 73.6 = 86.18, *yasyā 'nubandhāt pāpīyān adhoniṣṭho vipadyate*. Mss. *'nubandhaḥ*. (See Edgerton, *AJP* 36. 256 f.) There is no need to emend; *anubandha* here means 'consequence' instead of 'attachment,' as Hertel understands it. '(What wise man, pray, would perform a disgusting deed for the sake of that,) the consequence of which is evil and comes to naught when it gets to the lower world [after death]?'

16. 74.10 = 88.7, *avyavasāyīnam alasaṁ dāivaparaṁ pāuruṣāc ca parihīnam*. Mss. *pāuruṣavihīnam* (a) or *puruṣaparihīnam* (β), for *pāu*°. As the reading of a is precisely synonymous with Hertel's wholly unnecessary emendation, I infer that metrical considerations must have influenced Hertel; his emendation makes the stanza into an āryā. But as it stands in the mss. (either group!) it makes a perfectly good upagīti stanza, and therefore no change is called for. The reading of β is inferior; it would mean 'abandoned by mankind.'—Hertel's treatment of this stanza is all the more surprising because in vs 2.83 he quite unnecessarily adopts a reading which makes an upagīti stanza out of an āryā; see below, number 48.

17. 74.29 = 89.1, *kiṁ dhanena kariṣyanti dehino bhaṅgurāśrayāḥ*. Mss. *tv anena* for *dhanena*. The word *dhanam* occurs in the next pāda and is understood from it; the pronoun holds the thought in suspense deliberately, as frequently in such proverbial stanzas. 'What can mortals do with *that* [referring ahead to 'wealth'], since their position is insecure?'—(That on account of which they desire *wealth*, namely the body, is impermanent!)

18. 75.4 = 89.7, *adanāḥ*. So both editions; critical note gives the reading of all mss. as *adhanāḥ*. Hertel's translation renders the word 'vermögenslos,' which is exactly *adhanāḥ*; and so far as I can see *adanāḥ* makes no sense at all. I cannot understand Hertel's procedure here. I should suspect a misprint but for (1) the repetition of *adanāḥ* in the *ed. min.*, and (2) the critical note giving the mss. reading as *adhanāḥ*!

19. 79.20 = 94.8, *dhanena*. Mss. *tv anena* (as in number 17, above). See below, number 82.

20. 79.22 = 94.11. There is no lacuna in the text, as assumed by Hertel. The mistake is evidently due to Hertel's misinterpretation of the word *hiraṇyābhyavapattāu*, in the next line, in which H. takes the form *hiraṇya-* for a proper name. But it is a common noun. The sentence means: 'My mind has become completely satisfied with the loss of my money.' *Abhy-ava-pad* is not found, but *ava-pad* means *to be deprived of*, and there is no evidence that it could ever mean *to take refuge with*, which is implied by Hertel's rendering of *abhyavapattāu*.

21. 80.16 = 95.7, *nimittam cā 'pi hetunā*. Mss. *hetutaḥ*, confirmed by Mbh. I. 140.88 and XII. 140.32, the same stanza. 'And (he should derive) the cause also from a (further) reason.'

22. 81.9 = 96.7, *sarpāir vā saha vasatām udīrṇadarpāir*. Mss. *mandāir* for *sarpāir* (em. from Pūrṇ). 'Or of those dwelling together with foolish and arrogant men.'

23. 81.13 = 96.11, *yadahe cā 'thavā nīsi*. Mss. *yac ca vā* for *cā 'thavā*. 'On whatever day, and whatever (is destined) even by night'; *vā* is not quite correctly translated by 'even,' tho I think of no closer equivalent in English; it emphasizes the alternative nature of *nīsi* in relation to *-ahe*. At any rate, the reading of the mss. is excellent and perfectly clear Sanskrit.

24. 81.19 = 96.17, *hartā*. Mss. *hantā* (P *hattā*). 'Destroyer' fits as well as 'remover.'

25. 82.19 = 97.20, *citrāṅgaḥ*. Mss. *citrāṅga*. The voc. is changed to a nom. by Hertel because the deer's name has not previously been told to the tortoise, whose speech begins at this point. An instance of quite unnecessary super-rationalism; such unevennesses in Hindu story-telling are frequent.

26. 82.30 = 98.7, *kīlasaktacarmapāśenā 'vabaddham*. Mss. *kīle śīkyacarma°* (a, *śākyacarma°*): 'bound to a post by a loop of leather thong,' adopting the reading of β. (The *a* reading is merely a corruption.) The word *śīkya* means a loop cord, a sort of lasso, used e. g. for carrying burdens and for holding the scales of a balance. It fits perfectly in this place.

27. 83.27 = 99.13, *niyaticeṣṭitasya*. Mss. *niyata°*; the p. p. ('that which is destined') may certainly be used as the equivalent of the nom. act. *niyati*.

28. 85.20 = 102.2, *asvāsthyam*. Mss. *āsvasthyam* or *āsvāstyam* (sic). The former is a perfectly normal derivative in the suffix *ya*, with vṛiddhi of the first syllable, from *asvastha*. The latter also, with the correction *th* for *t*, would be a perfectly normal form, with 'double vṛiddhi' (Whitney, Gr. 1204 f). Either is preferable to Hertel's emendation.

29. 86.18-19 = 103.2-3, *mantrāṇām parato nā 'sti bījam uccāraṇam tathā, asambaddhapralāpā na kāryam sādhayitum kṣamāḥ*. Mss. *uccāraṇam*, and *°pralāpe-na*. Hertel utterly misunderstands this stanza. The readings of the mss. are quite correct. Translate: 'There is no germ [technical term for the essential part, core, of a mantra] nor pronunciation [of a mantra] apart from the mantras [to which they pertain]. By disconnected muttering people cannot accomplish any object [which would be accomplished by the mantra].'

30. 87.7 = 103.14, *niyati*°. Mss. *niyata*°; see number 27, above.

31. 87.18 = 104.6, *pathy aṭanapratimās te jīvitakāntāraśeṣa-sya*. Mss. *pathya-dhana*°, which should certainly be kept. '(Days spent with friends) ar like journey-money (Reisegeld) for one who has nothing left but the wilderness of life (to travel thru).' The *tertium comparationis* is that they help to make the journey comparatively easy and plesant.

32. 88.9 = 105.3, *yāvad askhalitām tāvat sukham yāti same pathi*. Mss. *askhalitas*; middle in force, because the verb is intrans. in the activ. It may therefore be personal, just like the very common *gataḥ* etc. 'As long as he has not stumbled, so long,' etc.

33. 88.13 = 105.7, *mārgaśrāntasya viśrāme mitrachāyā 'pi dūṣitā*. Mss. *viśrāmo*, which makes much better sense than the emendation: 'The shade- (that consists in a) frend, which is a rest for one weary from the journey, is also spoild.'

34. 88.20 = 105.13, *utpādabhaṅguram*. Mss. *utpāta*°: 'subject to destruction by sudden accidents.'

II. UNFORTUNATE SELECTIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS MANUSCRIPT READINGS

Most of my differences of opinion with Hertel in this regard ar, as wil appear, based merely on considerations of intrinsic plausibility—on superior sense and consistency with the context. In a few cases they ar based on the support given by other Pañc. versions to the reading of one group of Tantr. mss. In these cases Hertel has to som extent been led astray, as it seems to me, by his theory that the β 'recension' has been contaminated by other texts (above, p. 275, note 2). Yet he has not consistently acted on this theory. In very many cases he adopts a reading of β which is certainly no better than that of α , and in some cases, as wil appear below, he even adopts inferior readings of β . As I am convinst that β is just as pure a tradition of Tantr. as is α , I believ that in evry case in which a β reading is supported by the other recensions it should be adopted, as being almost certainly the reading of the 'Urpañcatantra' and so of Tantr.

35. 54.17 = 64.15, *itaś ce 'taḥ*. So α ; read with β *itaś ce 'taś ca*. The word *ca* can hav no force, so far as I can see, unless

it goes with the correlativ *ca* after the second *itaḥ*. Hertel's translation, in fact, ignores *ca*.

36. 58.2 = 69.4, *capalo na capala iti*; read with P and Pūrṇ *capalo 'capala iti*, or perhaps better yet (as is acutely suggested by Hertel himself in his critical note) *capalaś capala iti*. This could easily have been misunderstood and corrupted into *capalo 'capala iti*.

37. 59.25 = 71.9-10, *cittavittābhyām saṅgamo*. Read with β *cittasaṅgamaṁ* (cf. above, number 8). This makes better sense; it is union 'by the hart,' not 'by hart and profit,' that is contrasted with union by profit alone. And this is confirmed by the Pahlavi versions; both the Old Syriac and the Arabic, with all descendants of the latter, speak of the hart (alone) in contrast with profit.

38. 59.31, 32 = 71.15, 16, *bādhyante*. In both lines β reads *badhyante*, which is clearly meant for *vadhyante*; Simpl. has forms of *vadh-* in its version of the stanza, and this makes fully as good sense as *bādh-*, if not better. I should therefore be inclined to read *vadhyante*, which may be called the reading of β (of course *b* and *v* are absolutely interchangeable in mss.). I admit, however, that Hertel's reading is possible.

39. 60.19 = 72.12, *bhūtvā*, so β ; *a* omits the word, which is not only unnecessary but disturbing. Hertel's translation ignores it.

40. 61.1 = 73.1, *tatrāi 'va ca tat kathayisyāmi*. Read with β *gataḥ* for *ca tat*: 'When I have gone there I will tell you.' This is confirmed by SP, Simpl, Pūrṇ, Syr, and Ar; the Skt. versions all read *tatrāi 'va gatvā* (Pūrṇ *gataḥ*—exactly as Tantr β).

41. 61.13-16 = 73.13-15. There is no lacuna, as Hertel assumes in line 13. Read with R *sa āha* after *tarkitam* in 14, and omit with R *punar apy āha* in 16 (15); no ms. has *punar apy* (cf. number 9, above). In 13 the crow speaks: 'Friend, at first I did not realize that it was you at all, judging by your usual appearance.' The other [= tortoise] said: 'Because crows . . .' etc.

42. 61.27 = 74.2. The passage found in the β mss. after this line certainly belongs to the original; it has correspondents in Simpl, Pūrṇ, Syr, and Ar; cf. also Som 86 *tayor ubhayoḥ kākakūrmayoḥ*, which seems to reflect the same passage. Hertel

should certainly hav printed it. He does, in fact, translate it in his translation.

43. 66.18 = 79.9, *pūrvākhyāte śeṣam ālāpam aśṛṇavam*. I think 'śeṣam should be printed, 'the entire,' insted of *śeṣam*, 'das übrige' (so Hertel; but ? I can find no authority for such an adjectival use of *śeṣa*; it should be *ālāpaśeṣa*!) But the correct reading seems to me that of β , *pūrvākhyātām* (adverb) *aśeṣam* etc.: 'I herd the entire conversation in the manner as described before.'

44. 66.20 = 79.11, *yato*. So ms. z of β . Either *tato* (a) or *ato* (R) would be preferable.

45. 67.21 = 80.17. We should add *hy* at the end of the line, with *a* and *Pūrṇ*, to avoid the hiatus. The occurrence of another *hi* in the next line is no objection, as the two *hi*'s belong to different clauses; and both ar most appropriate in meaning.

46. 68.6 = 81.4, *tyaktalokakriyādārah*. Hertel, 'von den Taten [dem Verkehr] und der Achtung der Welt verlassen'; this seems very straind. Hertel's text follows ms. z, of β ; R, also of β , reads °*ācārah*; the *a* mss. read °*ādhārāh*. The tru reading, it seems to me, is clearly °*ādhārāh*: 'he has lost all support (basis) for worldly activity.'

47. 68.13 = 81.11, *na kaścīd anyah prativacanam api dadāti*. The β mss. hav *prṣṭaḥ* after *anyah*, which seems much better.

48. 72.17 = 86.7. Read with β *jagati jantoḥ* for *jantoḥ*. No change in meaning, but we thereby get an āryā stanza, which is more usual, insted of an upagīti, as Hertel's text has it. Haplografy wil account for the omission (the eye skipping from *ja-gati* to *ja-ntoḥ*). Cf. number 16, above.

49. 74.18 = 88.15, *paribhavavaśaṁ*. Read with β , SP, n, Hit, and *Pūrṇ*, *paribhavapadaṁ*. No change in meaning. Note that two emendations from SP etc., without the support of any Tantr. ms., ar introduced by Hertel in this same line! He was right in so doing; but he should hav been the more redy to admit the variant °*padaṁ* of β .

50. 74.28 = 88.25, *tad arthān āpacate sucaritam api; manuṣyaṁ kṣaṇād dhvaṁsayanti*. So only P. For *arthān āpacate*, the others all intend *arthā nāmāi 'te* (precisely so R; z °*nāmete*, p °*nāma ete*), and this reading, with deletion of the mark of punctuation, givs very much better sense than Hertel's labord

rendering: 'It is just this thing welth that right speedily causes the destruction of a man, even if he be virtuous.'

51. 75.10 = 89.13, *tathā kartṛsahasreṣu kartāraṁ karma vindati*. This is the reading of *a*, except that *kartṛ*° is Hertel's emendation for *karma*°. The *β* mss. agree with Simpl and Pūrṇ in reading *tathā pūrvakṛtāṁ karma kartāraṁ anuvindati* (Pūrṇ *evam* for *tathā*; Pūrṇ and Simpl *anugacchati*). The corruption in *a* is itself a dubious thing; and Hertel's attempt, *ZDMG* 59.5 f., to show that the *β* reading is secondary, leaves me unconvinced. Read with *β*.

52. 76.7 = 90.9-10, *viprakṛṣṭatarāṁ grāmasya*. Hertel: 'da weit und breit kein Dorf vorhanden ist.' I do not see how this or any other good meaning can be got from the reading. The *β* mss. have *viprakṛṣṭam antaraṁ grāmasya*, which is obviously required: 'It is a considerable distance to a village (or, to town).' The syllable *man* (written of course *maṁ*) has been left out in *a*.

53. 76.11 = 90.13, *evam bhavān*; the addition *pramādī* (*β*) seems absolutely necessary to the sense—so much so that Hertel is constrained to insert it in italics in his translation! Why he did not adopt it in his text I cannot imagine.

54. 78.17 = 93.5, *dāivapurusa-yogād arhotpattiḥ*. The *β* mss. insert *kāra* after *puruṣa*, which is much better: 'thru a combination of fate and human effort' is surely better than '. . . of fate and man'! This is the standard contrast in this quite common situation; cf. e. g. Yājñ. 1. 348 (quoted in BR), *dāive puruṣakāre ca*. A derivativ like *pāuruṣa* might be set off against *dāiva*—but not the simple *puruṣa*.

55. 78.21 = 93.8, *vaṇijakāu*. The *β* mss. have *vāṇijakāu*, which is a word found repeatedly in literature, and therefore should be preferred to *va*°, which like *vaṇija* is known only lexically.

56. 79.11 = 94.1, *dāivacodito*. The *a* mss. *deva*°, which is much better; it was 'the god' and not 'fate' that impelled him, as the story indicates.

57. 79.15 = 94.4.5, *śayane sopacāre svāstīrṇe*. The *β* mss. have the preferable *sopacāraṁ* (adverb, 'with great ceremony'; going closely with *svāstīrṇe*, as the order shows). Hertel renders 'geshmückt,' which is perhaps possible, but seems much less

likely. It is easy to see how the form in °am between the two locativ forms became corrupted to °e; while the reverse corruption is much less easy to conceive.

58. 80.2 = 94.14, *jīvanti nityam puruṣās ta eva*. The β mss. with Pūrṇ read *te sat-* for *nityam*, which gives a sense that seems to me *a priori* better: 'They ar (really) alive, and it is just they that ar noble men.' Otherwise, in Hertel's text, *puruṣās* is weak—tho not impossible.

59. 81.1 = 95.24, *prākkarmāyatijanito hi yo vipākaḥ*. Hertel: 'Das Reifen, das durch die Fortwirkung der früheren Tat erzeugt ist.' Can *āyati*, 'extension,' mean 'Fortwirkung' in this sense? Possibly; but it seems to me, in any case, that the better reading is that of the α mss., *prākkarma prati janito* : ' . . . which is produced in accordance with previous deeds.'

60. 81.23 = 96.21, *jhaḡ-iti*. No ms. has this form, tho p and β hav *jhāg-iti*; but one β ms. corrects the *g* to *ṭ*, and P, an α ms., has *jhaṭ-iti*. Under these circumstances it is hard to see why Hertel introduced a textual emendation in order to present the excessively rare *jhaḡ-iti*, insted of the common *jhaṭ-iti*.

61. 82.29 = 98.6, *tad upalabhyatām utplutya yathāvasthitām citrāṅgavārttām*. So far as I can see, this sentence is ungrammatical. How can the passiv verb be construed with the following acc.? If all the mss. read this, an emendation would be necessary. But the β mss. hav a perfectly simple and obviously correct reading; *upalabhasvo 'tplutya* etc. Hertel: 'Fliege denn empor und ziehe zuverlässige Kunde über C. ein.' This correctly translates the β reading; I wish Hertel would explain how he gets it out of the text he prints!

62. 82.32 = 98.9, *-upādeyam*. So only z and R's second hand; α and R's first hand hav *-upādheyam*, which is perfectly possible (it means practically the same as *-upādeyam*), and should be kept as the reading indicated by the most (and, according to Hertel, best) mss.

63. 83.2 = 98.10, *bhavān anabhijñāḥ*; the necessary completion of the frase is found in β, *pāśachedanakarmaṇaḥ*. It is surely not ment to be said that the crow is 'ignorant' absolutely! Quite the contrary. But he does not kno how to cut the bonds. Cf. 83.13 = 98.21, which mathematically proves my point.

64. 83.27 = 99.13, *anabhijñō 'si niyaticeṣṭitasya* (read *niyata*°,

cf. number 27, above). The β mss. read *abhijño*, 'You know the actions of fate.' This is confirmed by Pūrṇ, and is more in keeping with what we should expect; cf. 55.27 ff. = 66.8 ff.

65. 83.28-29 = 99.14-15, *mā bhāṣiṣiḥ, vartate mayi pārśvasthe lubdhakāt kaścīd apāyaḥ*. The β mss. add *tvam* after *bhāṣiṣiḥ*, and *na* before *vartate*. Instead of a 'Schlimmbesserung,' as Hertel calls this in the note to his translation, I regard it as almost certainly the original reading. Hertel is constrained to understand *vartate* etc. as a rhetorical question: 'Is there any danger while I am here?' The negative surely is a simpler reading; and it is confirmed by SP (*mayi pārśvasthe 'pi na lubdhakād bhayam*) and Pūrṇ (*mayi pārśvasthe na bhetaṇyam*), while Simpl indeed has a question, but introduces it with a clear interrogative word, as Tantr. should also if a question is really meant (Simpl: *kiṁ mayy api samāyāte lubdhakād bibheṣi?*). Hertel's remarks in ZDMG 59.6 leave me unconvinced; the putting *na vartate* at the beginning may indicate nothing but emphasis on these words. I am not denying the possibility of H's reading; I only say that the other is so much simpler and more natural, that I feel sure it must be the right one—especially as it is closer to those of the other versions.

66. 84.3 = 99.19, *śaḍjātayaḥ* (!), must surely be a misprint for *ṣaḍ°*, altho it is repeated in the *ed. min.*! The critical note gives *śaḍjātinaḥ* as the β reading. Of course read *ṣaḍ-*.

67. 85.4 = 101.7, *snigdhadrava°*. Read with *a snigdhadra-vya°*; cf. number 11, above.

68. 86.7 = 102.11, *ato 'yam amānuṣaḥ*. Hertel: 'Darum ist dieser kein Mensch.' But what the prince feared was, not that the deer was a *human*, but that it was a monster. The β mss. read *nā 'to* for *ato*: 'Therefore this is no monster (Unmensch, Unhold, devil).' This seems preferable; it makes *amānuṣa* a positive concept instead of a purely negative one. Cf. especially BR s. v. *amanuṣya*, 3.

69. 88.13 = 105.7. After this line the β mss. have a prose insertion (found in an imperfect form in the mss., to be sure), which evidently corresponds to something in the original—also reflected in Simpl (Kielhorn and Bühler, 1st ed., B. S. S. III, p. 45, lines 12 *aparam* . . . 16 *suhṛn me*), and in Pahl (Syr and Ar). For comparative purposes, at least, this is most important; and it seems to me certain that the Tantr. had *something*

here (even tho our imperfect mss. do not permit us to determine the language in full).

70. 89.5 = 106.7. After this line too the β mss. have something which Hertel communicates only in his critical note. I do not think that the words in this case are incomplete; it is probably a mere accident that they can be read as a fragment of a śloka verse. For they are complete in meaning and correspond very closely to the parallel passage in Pūrṇ. Thus, Tantr.: *kaṣṭam bhoḥ!* [At this point begins the seeming fragment of a śloka] *tādṛṇmitraviyogo 'pi viśmṛtaḥ kiṁ nijaṛasi svajanāir* [z. *sujanāir*] ?—Pūrṇ: *tat kaṣṭam bhoḥ! mitraviyogena hato 'ham, iti kiṁ nijaṛ api svajanāḥ?*—Now no other Sanskrit version has anything like this, nor has the Syriac; but in the Arabic is found a passage which I believe came from the same original Skt. I admit the meaning is a good deal transformed; but no one who has studied the Pahl. versions in relation to the Skt. will be seriously troubled by this! Indeed, neither of the two versions of the Ar which I shall presently quote is more remote from the Skt. than the two are from each other; and yet it is certain that both of them go back to some single Arabic version, at least. Cheikho's text has in the corresponding place: 'Just so is the man who has quieted his wounds in the company of his friends, and has then lost them.' Halil's edition has: 'And recognize that whoever has lost his friends after he has been united with them does not cease from having broken his back[?] by the sorrow of his soul.' (Literal translations of the Arabic made for me by Dr. W. N. Brown.)—On the basis of these passages in Tantr. β , Pūrṇ, and Ar, I think it may be assumed with plausibility (of course not with certainty) that the original Pañc. had something of the sort. And therefore I think the β reading should be inserted in the text of Tantr.

III. EMENDATIONS OF THE TEXT, PROPOSED BY THE PRESENT WRITER

71. 60.23 = 72.16, *aprcchat*. No question is asked, however. The following sentence, *aham asmāt sthānād anyat sthānam gacchāmi*, is clearly a plain statement of fact, or rather of actual intention. Hertel, to make *aprcchat* consistent, renders 'darf ich . . . gehen?'—a meaning which the words surely do not in the least justify. It seems to me that we should read *āprcchat*,

‘took leav of.’ By this extremely slight and simple change we get a meaning that fits the context admirably.

72. 61.11 = 73.11, *pravṛttakāryavisrambho*. It seems that °*āvisrambho* should be red: ‘Tho he posset a matchless water-stronghold, nevertheless M. was afraid; for he knew wel about times and places, and (so) was distrustful of the matter that was pending.’

73. 61.18 = 73.17, *nirvedakāraṇam ākhum ākhyātavān*. This should mean ‘told about the mouse (who was) the cause of his despair’; and so, essentially, Hertel renders it. But the mouse had absolutely nothing to do with the crow’s *nirveda*, according to either the Tantr.’s version of the story, or that of any other Pāñc. recension known to me. Quite the contrary! In short, the statement makes nonsense, if understood in this way. At most the words could mean ‘told about the cause of his despair and about the mouse.’ But (aside from the lack of *ca*) in the very next line the tortoise asks how on erth the crow came to be associated with the mouse—a quite unherd-of thing. Would he ask such a question if the crow had just ‘explaind about the mouse’ to him?—I would therefore read *nirvedakāraṇamukham ākhyātavān*, ‘told about the beginnings of the cause of his despair.’ The proximity of the word *ākhunā* might easily hav caused the slight corruption (*u* has slipt under the wrong consonant).

74. 62.14 = 74.14-15, *bhavān ito mayā viyuktaḥ; tata ārabhya* . . . Hertel, ‘Ihr hattet Euch hier von mir getrennt.’ But this is flatly contradicted by the monk’s own statement below, that they became separated at *Puṣkara*. Read (for *ito*) *yato*, to which the following *tata* is correlativ. ‘From the time when you became separated from me . . .’

75. 64.6 = 76.11, *mṛgaṃ viddhvā*. The word *viddhvā* is Hertel’s emendation for *a vyadhāvya* (p °*va*), *z vyādhādyā*, R *hatvā*. But SP and n read *vyāpādyā*, and it seems obvious that the Tantr. mss. readings ar mere corruptions of this.

76. 64.11 = 76.15, *na me dhanur nā ’pi ca bāṇasaṃdhanam*. In view of the immediately preceding words *dhanuḥ saśaram ca krtve ’dam uvāca*, how can the hunter say ‘I hav no bow’? Should we not read *dhanor* and °*saṃdhanāt*, depending on the expression of fearing in the next pāda? ‘Not of my bow nor of

the putting on of my arrow does this boar show any fear at-all (*kim*)!' This fits the requirements of the context admirably.

77. 66.5 = 78.15, *kenāpi sādhanā*. This reference to a 'holy man' as depositor of the mouse's hidden treasure is a strange bit of satire—if correct. The Syr has 'Ich weiss nicht wie,' which suggests *kenāpi sādhanena*, 'by som means or other.' Arabic similarly.

78. 68.17 = 81.15. For this line the β mss. read: *śūnyaḥ kṣanena bhavatī 'ty aticitram etat*. In his discussion of this line (reff. in his notes) Hertel seems to me to pay insufficient attention to the fact that the α mss. also hav this version of the pāda (with omission of the first word), added after the next-following prose sentence! This seems to me clearly to indicate that the version found first in the α mss., and adopted in Hertel's text, interesting as it is *per se*, is a secondary doublet; the tru version is surely that found in both groups of mss. The progenitor of the α mss. inserted the variant, doutless on the margin; and later copyists inserted it in the text—but without deleting the original reading, which has merely got crowded out of place, with accidental loss of the first word. This is confirmd by the fact that other versions of the stanza read substantially with β (e. g. Vikrama-carita SR. 21.8, as wel as all other Pañc. versions). But the first word, *śūnyaḥ*, found in the β mss., is obviously corrupt; it has crept in from the preceding stanza (of β), 59, where the stem *śūnya* is four times repeated. The tru reading is *so 'nyaḥ*. The Vikr. version is: *so 'py anya eva bhavatī 'ti kim atra citram*. SP, n, Hit, and Pūrṇ agree practically with Tantr. β ; for *śūnyaḥ* (*so 'nyaḥ*) SP and Pūrṇ read *cā 'nyaḥ* (but SP α *ko 'nyaḥ*), n *cānma*, Hit *anyaḥ*.

79. 70.1 = 83.6, *girivarataṭāḍ*. In the preceding pāda of this stanza Hertel (quite rightly) emended mss. *param* to *varam*. It seems to me that in this pāda *vara* should clearly be changed to *para*; in other words, the mss. hav simply exchanged the words *vara* and *para* in the two lines (a process the like of which occurs repeatedly, cf. number 84 below). 'From the slope of a mountain-summit.'

80. 75.23 = 89.26, *saṁcīyate*. This is Hertel's emendation for mss. *saṁ* (or *sa*, or *ca*)-*ḍīyate*. The same sense would be given by *saṁdhīyate*, which would be nearer to the reading of the mss.; *d* and *dh* ar frequently confused.

81. 76.19 = 91.2, *cittam āsthāya*. Hertel, 'richtete seinen Sinn auf.' Surely *āsthāpya* should be red.

82. 79.19-20 = 94.8, *bhogā idrśo me bhavantu, kiṃ dhanena* (mss. *tv anena*, see number 19 above) . . . This is a hard passage. The words *bhogā idrśo* ar Hertel's guess for a *bhoga-varmaṇo*, β *bhogā-drśo*. Moreover *a* has *bhavatu*. I suggest, tho without entire confidence: *bhogā idrśo me bhavatu, kiṃ tv anena* [sc. *bhogena*] . . . This is at least much closer to the mss. than Hertel's reading, and it seems to make good sense.

83. 83.6 = 98.14, *ca vittasthā 'sti*. Surely an impossible form; at least I cannot understand it. I can suggest nothing better than the Mbh. reading (cf. Thomas, *JRAS* 1910, p. 1350), *pariniṣṭhā 'sti*.

84. 87.16 = 104.4, *kasya mahotsavakalpāḥ priyasvajanasamgamā na syuḥ*. This is a troublesom passage. In the first place, I believ we must read *yasya* for *kasya*; note that in the preceding pāda Hertel had to emend the mss. *yasya* to *kasya* (with Simpl and Pūrṇ)—rightly, I think; cf. my remarks under number 79 above. Simpl and Pūrṇ also read *yadi* for Tantr. mss. *kasya*, which seems to me to confirm my suggestion. In other words, the mss. hav got *yasya* and *kasya* interchanged. The usual Hindu habit of putting the relativ clause first, which this stanza violates, doubtless had something to do with the double corruption. In the second place, Hertel's reconstruction of the second half of this line seems most unfortunate—altho som change from the mss. readings is necessary, as the meter shows. The mss. read: *priyajanasamāgama-(R°mā)-na* (P°*nas*, p°*nās*) *syuḥ*. Now this much seems to me clear, that *priyajana* here is set off against *dayitajana* of pāda a and *svajana* of pāda b. Hertel fails to see this, and renders all three as if they wer practically synonyms, making a very feeble stanza out of one that has a perfectly definit and pointed meaning. Hence, Hertel's insertion of *-sva-* in the last pāda cannot be right; for we hav *svajana* in pāda b, and pāda d certainly deals with somthing contrasted therewith.—By assuming a haplografic loss of a syllable *-nā-* (or *-na-*, cf. p's reading), we get a perfectly metrical version without any other change in the mss. reading. Thus: *priyajanasamāgamanā na syuḥ*. And we thereby get excellent sense in the entire stanza: 'Who could endure separation from

his beloved [*dayita-jana*], and parting from his family [*sva-jana*], wer it not for his association with frends [*priya-jana*], which is so like a great festival?' The only possible objection to my suggestion is that it makes *samāgamana* masculin (or possibly feminin, °*nā*? cf. Whitney, 1150 a), whereas it ought to be, and regularly is, neuter. But cf. my remarks on number 8 above, and also *āsvāda*, indubitably used as neuter in 70.10 = 83.15, altho we have not even the authority of a Hindu lexicografer, so far as recorded, for making it anything but masculin. Som masculin or feminin noun must belong in the present passage, as °*kalpāḥ* shows. And P and p point to an ending -*anās*.

IV. CORRECTIONS OF HERTEL'S TRANSLATION

I hav made no attempt to criticize Hertel's Translation rigorously. But in working over the text, I hav of course used the translation freely. And, naturally, I hav noted quite a number of points, large and small, in which I should hav chosen different language. The following notes make no pretense at exhaustivness. They include the most important and certain of the changes I would make in the translation, in so far as they hav not been previously publisht by others (in reviews of Hertel's work). In other words, I append here only a few corrections (1) which seem to me so evidently sound as to make discussion unnecessary, and (2) which ar distinctly important to a correct understanding of the text (not mere turns of expression or minor matters), and (3) which hav not, to my knowledge, been printed before (with the single exception of No. 86).

85. 54.12 = 64.11, *āhāryāir dhānyakāṇāir*. Hertel 'zusammengelesen' for *āhāryāir*; rather, 'to serv as bait (food, *āhāra*).'

86. 61.7 = 73.7, *ekārimitratām tena gatas*. 'Die mit ihr, ihrer grössten Feindin, Freundschaft geschlossen hatte.' But *ekāri*° means 'a state of having the same enemies and frends,' 'an offensiv and defensiv alliance.' (This was questioningly suggested by Thomas, *JRAS* 1910, p. 1352.) SPa and n hav the same word (insted of Tantr. *ekāntamitratām*) in their version of Tantr. vs 38, where the context makes the meaning absolutely unmistakable.

87. 64.13 = 76.17, *prasahya*. Not 'mich beherrschend,' but 'decidedly,' 'assuredly.' In the same line I think that *asya niścayaṃ* means 'the certainty about him,' not 'seine Absicht.'

88. 68.21 = 81.19, *na cā 'pabhāṣaṇam*. Not 'und die Rede-weise [grammatisch] fehlerlos,' but 'and no reviling [in his speech].—In the preceding line H. renders *vilocane cā 'vikale ca vīkṣate* by 'Die Augen sind unverseht und sehen,' as if we had *vīkṣete* (which by the way would be metrically impossible). The text seems to be incorrect, but I do not think of any very satisfactory emendation. The two *ca*'s are troublesome. I have thought of *vīkṣataḥ* and *vīkṣitum*; neither is over-attractive; nor does it seem helpful to take *vīkṣate* as dative of the active participle.

89. 69.13 = 82.14, *vāirāgyāharaṇam*. Not 'die Entfernung der Entsagung,' but quite the contrary, 'a cause of disgust with life.'

90. 69.14 = 82.15, *paryāyo maraṇasya*. Not 'die Wiederholung des Sterbens,' but 'a synonym for death.'

91. 71.24 = 85.9, *prāṇānāṃ ca dhanasya sādhanadhiyām anyonyahetuḥ paṇaḥ*. Hertel, with complete misunderstanding, 'Der Paṇa [eine kleine Münze] ist die gegenseitige Ursache der Ueberlegungen, wie man das Leben und das Gut erwerben kann.' It means: '[There is] a staking [hazard; *paṇa* = stake, in gambling etc.] of both life and wealth for the sake of each other on the part of those who are anxious to attain them.' People risk their lives for the sake of money, and vice versa. This is the whole point of the stanza, as is indicated by Hertel's own translation of the rest of it.

92. 80.6 = 94.18, *jīvitamātrasārāḥ*. Not 'vergeuden [eigentlich, verschleuchen] nur ihr Leben' (note that 'nur' in Hertel's rendering really modifies 'vergeuden,' whereas the Sanskrit order shows that it should modify 'Leben'); but 'are devoted solely to their (own) lives.'

93. 80.7-8 = 94.19-20, *kṛtā na . . . yāñ suhṛtsvayaṃgrāhavibhūṣaṇā śrīḥ*. Not 'die ihre Śrī . . . nicht freiwillig mit Freunden schmücken,' but 'who do not make their fortune the voluntary (= freely offered) adornment of their friends.'

Vss. 126 ff. (80.15 ff. = 95.6 ff.). The translation of these difficult stanzas will be greatly improved by consulting the com-

mentators on the Mbh., from which they are taken, as was pointed out by Thomas in his review of Hertel (*JRAS* for 1910, p. 1358 ff.). But for Thomas's reference I should have doubtless had no better luck with them than Hertel did.

94. 81.23 = 96.21, *ānīya . . . ghaṭayati vidhir abhimatam abhimukhībhūtaḥ*. Not 'bringt das Schicksal das Gewünschte . . . herbei, wenn es [= das Schicksal] sich uns zuwendet [wenn es uns geneigt ist],' but 'fate fetches . . . and presents itself and contrives its purpose.'

95. 89.19 = 106.19-20, *aṅgulapramāṇām khaṇḍasāś chinnām rajjum*. Not 'den in fingerbreite Stückchen zernagten Strick,' but '(saw) the cord, which was thick as a man's finger, cut in pieces.'